HP

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,970	07/26/2001	Daniel C. Castle	10005874-1	8587

7590 06/24/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
STEVENS, ROBERT	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/916,970	CASTLE, DANIEL C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert M Stevens	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 May 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 5/23/2005 to the original application filed 7/26/2001 by Castle entitled "Advertisement Selection Engine For Placing Micro-Advertising".

2. The Office maintains the rejections of claims 1-20 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph raised in the previous action. These rejections have been restated below, in light of (i.e., necessitated by) the amended claims.

3. The Office further rejects claims 17-20 under 35 USC 112 second paragraph, in light of the amended claims.

4. The Office withdraws the rejections raised in the previous action concerning claims 1-11, 14-15 and 17-20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Bier, in light of the amendment.

5. The Office withdraws the rejections raised in the previous action concerning claims 12-13 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Bier and further in view of Lemay, in light of the amendment.

6. The Office raises further rejections of the claims under 35 USC 103(a), in light of the amendment, as set forth below.

7. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 9, 14 and 17 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. **Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant does not provide enabling implementation details explaining how available unused white space, which does not interfere with information content, is determined. Reference amended claim 1 lines 3-4:

Claims 2-5 are dependent upon claim 1, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 6, Applicant does not provide enabling implementation details explaining how available unused space, which does not interfere with information content, is determined. Reference amended claim 6 lines 3-4.

Claims 7-8 are dependent upon claim 6, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 9, Applicant does not provide enabling implementation details explaining how available unused space, which does not interfere with information content, is determined. Reference amended claim 9 lines 6-7.

Claims 10-13 are dependent upon claim 9, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 14, Applicant does not provide enabling implementation details explaining how available unused space, which does not interfere with information content, is determined. Reference amended claim 14 lines 7-8.

Claims 15-16 are dependent upon claim 14, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 17, Applicant does not provide enabling implementation details explaining how available unused space, which does not interfere with information content, is determined. Reference amended claim 17 lines 4-5.

Claims 18-20 are dependent upon claim 17, and therefore likewise rejected.

Applicant asserts (see Remarks section on page 8 of Applicant's Amendment submitted 11/18/2004) that paragraphs [0015] – [0020] describing Fig. 2-3 provide enabling support. First, the Office notes that the described passage is found in the publication (US 2003/0023631), and that the originally filed application reference is page 3 line 5 through page 4 line 3. Regarding the independent claim limitations

directed to "white space determinations", this passage and the described Fig. 3 element #310 merely state that a determination is made. Fig. 1 merely shows a pre-insertion web page. Fig. 2 merely depicts a post-insertion web page, i.e., the purported result of Applicant's entire asserted invention.

This "white space determination" limitation is central to Applicant's asserted invention. Common sense dictates that enablement requires an explanation of how Applicant makes such a determination, not merely a statement that such a determination is being made. The Office has not levied a requirement to disclose code. One skilled in the software arts is aware that enablement may be accomplished via any one of several techniques.

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. **Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claim 17 recites the limitation "the processor" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, as amended. For the purposes of further examination, the Office will treat the claim's first limitation as reciting "a software module, executing on a processor, said software module configured to ...".

Claims 18-20 are dependent upon claim 17, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 1-11, 14-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (US Patent No. 6,487,538, filed Nov. 16, 1998 and issued Nov. 26, 2002, hereafter referred to as "Gupta") in view of Markowitz et al. (US Patent No. 6,311,185, filed Oct. 30, 1997 and issued Oct. 30, 2001, hereafter referred to as "Markowitz").

Regarding independent claim 1, Gupta discloses:

> *A method for placing a micro-advertisement on a world wide web page comprising information content* (Abstract), *the method comprising the steps of:*
>
> *... ;*
>
> *selecting the micro-advertisement, from a plurality of micro-advertisements, to place on the web page;* (col. 14 lines 9-16, re: selected advertisement [it being implicit that one selects from a plurality or pool]) *and*
>
> *automatically placing the micro-advertisement on the web page in the available unused space.* (col. 11 lines 21-31, re: "insert an advertisement" and empty slot)

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

> *automatically determining, using software, available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisement, the available space not interfering with the information content;*

Markowitz, though, discloses:

> *automatically determining, using software, available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisement, the available space not interfering with the information content;* (Fig. 4, col. 2 lines 10-15 and col. 3 lines 18-50)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Markowitz for the benefit of Gupta, because to do so would have allowed a system designer to add an advertisement without obscuring information on an original Web page, as taught by Markowitz in col. 2 lines10-15. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based advertising.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

> *the step of transmitting the page to a consumer.* (Abstract, esp. the 2nd sentence)

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

the step of transmitting the page to a consumer over the Internet. (Abstract, esp. the 2nd sentence)

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 2, the limitations of claim 2 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

wherein the step of selecting includes the step of determining the consumer's heuristics. (Abstract)

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 2, the limitations of claim 2 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

wherein the step of selecting includes the step of determining a value for the micro-advertisement. (col. 11 lines 32-38, re: cost for advertisement, and lines 51-65 discussing price negotiation)

Regarding independent claim 6, Gupta discloses:

A method for exposing a consumer to advertisements by placing a plurality of micro-advertisement (col. 11 lines 40-42) *on a web page comprising information content* (Abstract), *the method comprising the steps of:*

... ;

determining a value for each of the plurality of micro-advertisements; (col. 11 lines 32-38, re: cost for advertisement, and lines 51-65 discussing price negotiation)

selecting the plurality of micro-advertisements (col. 11 lines 40-42), *from a pool of micro-advertisements, in response to the available space and the value;* (col. 14 lines 9-16, re: selected advertisement [it being implicit that one selects from a plurality or pool]) *and*

automatically placing the plurality of micro-advertisements (col. 11 lines 40-42) *on the web page in the available space.* (col. 11 lines 21-24)

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

... :

using software for automatically determining available unused space on the web page for the plurality of micro-advertisements, the available unused space not interfering with the information content;

... ;
... ;
... .

Markowitz, though, discloses:

... :

using software for automatically determining available unused space on the web page for the plurality of micro-advertisements, the available unused space not interfering with the information content; (Fig. 4, col. 2 lines 10-15 and col. 3 lines 18-50)

... ;
... ;
... .

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Markowitz for the benefit of Gupta, because to do so would have allowed a system designer to add an advertisement without obscuring information on an original Web page, as taught by Markowitz in col. 2 lines10-15. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based advertising.

Claims 7-8 are substantially similar to claims 2-3, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 9, Gupta discloses:

A method for advertising to a consumer over the Internet, from an information service provider, using micro-advertisements on a web page comprising information content (Abstract), *the method comprising the steps of:*

receiving a request for information content from the consumer; (col. 11 lines 25-26)

formatting the information content on the web page; (It is well known in the art that client's browser formats web page in accordance with the HTML instructions found in a web page. See col. 3 lines 24-32 in conjunction with Fig. 5 #512.)

... ;

selecting the micro-advertisements in response to the available unused space; (col. 12 lines 23-28 re: inserting based upon advertising slot's characteristics and col. 11 lines 36-37 re: determining [i.e., selecting] which advertisement to insert) *and*

automatically placing the micro-advertisements on the web page in the available space. (col. 11 lines 21-31, re: "insert an advertisement" and empty slot)

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

... :

... ;

... ;

using software on the web page for automatically determining available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisements, the available space not interfering with the information content;

... ;

... .

Markowitz, though, discloses:

... :

... ;

... ;

using software on the web page for automatically determining available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisements, the available space not interfering with the information content; (Fig. 4, col. 2 lines 10-15 and col. 3 lines 18-50)

... ;

... .

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Markowitz for the benefit of Gupta, because to do so would have allowed a system designer to add an advertisement without obscuring information on an original Web page, as taught by Markowitz in col. 2 lines10-15. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based advertising.

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

> *wherein the step of selecting comprises selecting the micro-advertisements from a pool of micro-advertisements.* (col. 14 lines 9-16, re: selected advertisement [it being implicit that one selects from a plurality or pool])

Claim 11 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 14, Gupta discloses:

> *A method for advertising to a consumer over the Internet, from an information service provider, using micro-advertisements on a web page comprising information content* (Abstract), *the method comprising the steps of:*
>
> *the information service provider receiving a request for predetermined information content from the consumer;* (Fig. 5 #500 and #502)
>
> *formatting the information content on the web page;* (It is well known in the art that client's browser formats web page in accordance with the HTML instructions found in a web page. See col. 3 lines 24-32 in conjunction with Fig. 5 #512.)
>
> ... ;

determining a value for each of the plurality of micro-advertisements; (col. 11 lines 32-38, re: cost for advertisement, and lines 51-65 discussing price negotiation)

selecting the micro-advertisements (col. 11 lines 40-42) *in response to the available unused space and the value;* (col. 14 lines 9-16, re: selected advertisement [it being implicit that one selects from a plurality or pool])

automatically placing the plurality of micro-advertisements (col. 11 lines 40-42) *on the web page in the available unused space;* (col. 11 lines 21-24) *and*

transmitting the web page to the consumer. (Fig. 5 #512)

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

... :

... ;

... ;

using software on the web page for automatically determining available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisements, the available space not interfering with the information content;

... ;

... ;

... ;

... .

Markowitz, though, discloses:

... :

... ;

... ;

using software on the web page for automatically determining available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisements, the available space not interfering with the information content; (Fig. 4, col. 2 lines 10-15 and col. 3 lines 18-50)

... ;

... ;

... ;

... .

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Markowitz for the benefit of Gupta, because to do so would have allowed a system designer to add an advertisement without obscuring information on an original Web page, as taught by Markowitz in col. 2 lines10-15. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based advertising.

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent upon claim 14, the limitations of claim 14 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

> *wherein the step of selecting comprises selecting the micro-advertisements from a pool of micro-advertisements stored on the service provider's Web server.* (col. 14 lines 9-16, re: selected advertisement [it being implicit that one selects from a plurality or pool], it being merely a matter of obvious design choice where ads are stored)

Regarding independent claim 17, Gupta discloses:

> *A system for placing micro-advertisements on a web page comprising information content intended for a consumer* (Abstract), *the system comprising:*
>
> *a software module executing on a processor* (Fig. 2 #213), *said software module configured to ... and control processes for automatically placing micro-advertisements within the available unused space in response to micro-advertisement selection criteria;* (col. 11 lines 21-31, re: discussions on inserting an advertisement and empty slot, it being inherent/implicit that the disclosed functionality requires software, and the Abstract disclosing the use of a profile for targeted advertising)
>
> *memory* (Fig. 2 #215) *coupled* (Fig. 2 #218) *to the processor*(Fig. 2 #213), *the memory storing the micro-advertisement selection criteria used by the processor;* (Fig. 3 #304, it being a matter of obvious design choice what data one stores in what memory)
>
> *storage media* (Fig. 2 #212) *coupled* (Fig. 2 #218) *to the processor* (Fig. 2 #213), *the storage media storing the web page of information*

content, a plurality of micro-advertisements, and a plurality of micro-advertisement selection criteria associated with each micro-advertisement; (Fig. 3 #302 and #304 and descriptions at col. 9 lines 40-60, it being a matter of obvious design choice what data one stores in what memory) *and*

input/output apparatuses (Fig. 2 #219 and #220) *coupled* (Fig. 2 #218) *to the processor* (Fig. 2 #213), *the input/output apparatuses comprising means for transmitting the page comprising the information content and the micro-advertisement.* (Fig. 5 #512)

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

... :

... automatically determine available unused space on the web page that does not interfere with the information content ...;

... ;

... ;

... .

Markowitz, though, discloses:

... :

... automatically determine available unused space on the web page that does not interfere with the information content ...; (Fig. 4, col. 2 lines 10-15 and col. 3 lines 18-50)

... ;

... ;

... .

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Markowitz for the benefit of Gupta, because to do so would have allowed a system designer to add an advertisement without obscuring information on an original Web page, as taught by Markowitz in col. 2 lines10-15. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based advertising.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent upon claim 17, the limitations of claim 17 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

> *wherein the storage media comprises means for storing consumer profiles.* (Fig. 3 #304, re: "Profile")

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent upon claim 17, the limitations of claim 17 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

> *wherein the input/output apparatuses comprise an Internet interface that couples the system to the Internet.* (Fig. 2 communications path #219, 218, 220, 221, 222, 224 and 225)

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent upon claim 17, the limitations of claim 17 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

> *wherein the storage media comprises a disk drive for storing the page of information content, the plurality of micro-advertisements, and the plurality of micro-advertisement selection criteria associated with each micro-advertisement.* (col. 8 lines 32-35, re: "floppy disks ... computer hard drives")

14. **Claims 12-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (US Patent No. 6,487,538, filed Nov. 16, 1998 and issued Nov. 26, 2002, hereafter referred to as "Gupta") in view of Markowitz et al. (US

Patent No. 6,311,185, filed Oct. 30, 1997 and issued Oct. 30, 2001, hereafter referred to as "Markowitz") and further in view of Laura Lemay (SAM'S Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in 21 Days, 2nd Edition, Sam's Publishing, Indianapolis, IN, (c) 2000, pp. 360-361 and 364-365, hereafter referred to as "Lemay").

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

> *the step of the service provider accumulating the information content from various sources.*

Lemay, though, discloses:

> *the step of the service provider accumulating the information content from various sources.* (It is well known in the art that web page elements may be aggregated from more than one source. See p. 360, especially paragraph 2 under "Working with Frames" and Fig. 12.7 disclosing a web page having multiple frames, each containing separate content.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lemay for the benefit of Gupta in view of Markowitz, because to do so would allow one to display a number of separate HTML documents within a single screen as taught by Lemay in the 2nd paragraph under the p. 360 section "Working with Frames". These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., electronic document processing.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

> *the step of the service provider accumulating the information content from the service provider's Web server.*

Lemay, though, discloses:

> *the step of the service provider accumulating the information content from the service provider's Web server.* (It is well known in the art that web page elements may be aggregated from more than one source. See p. 360, especially paragraph 2 under "Working with Frames" and Fig. 12.7 disclosing a web page having multiple frames, each containing separate content.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lemay for the benefit of Gupta in view of Markowitz, because to do so would allow one to display a number of separate HTML documents within a single screen as taught by Lemay in the 2nd paragraph under the p. 360 section "Working with Frames". These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., electronic document processing.

Claim 16 is substantially similar to claim 12, and therefore likewise rejected.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 5/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to Applicant's remarks on pages 6-8 of the amendment concerning the FINAL 35 USC 112 first paragraph rejections of claims 1-20: As previously stated, the Office maintains the 35 USC 112 1st paragraph issues raised in the FINAL. Determination of "white space or the unused portions found on a web page" is at the core of Applicant's asserted invention. Common sense dictates that enablement requires an explanation of how Applicant makes such a determination, not merely a statement that such a determination is being made. The Office has not levied a requirement to disclose code. One skilled in the software arts is aware that enablement may be accomplished via any one of several techniques.

First, Applicant argues that one cannot use common sense in evaluating issues concerning patentability, yet sets forth no case law to support such a position. It's a safe bet that no tribunal has ever espoused the elimination of common sense in the analysis of legal issues.

Second, Applicant merely makes a bald statement "determine white space available" (e.g., see Fig. 3 #310) and then claims that enablement exists. There is no explanation as to how Applicant expects to accomplish this function. Common sense indicates that if there is no explanation as to how the Applicant implements a limitation, then experimentation is perforce required. The Office is not required nor equipped (with laboratory space, compilers, Integrated Development Environments, other software development tools, etc.) to develop Applicant's purported invention.

Third, although Applicant argues against a requirement for code in the specification, the Office has never asserted such a requirement. There are many ways to enable computer-related inventions, code recitation being a potential such technique. However, the Office has never required, during the prosecution of the instant Application, any particular technique to develop an enabled specification.

In regards to Applicant's remarks on page 8 of the amendment concerning the FINAL, Applicant argues for utility. The Office notes that no 35 USC 101 rejection was issued in the FINAL, and thus Applicant's utility arguments are rendered moot.

It is respectfully noted that Applicant's amendment to the independent claims significantly changes the scope of the claimed invention as a whole. As such, Applicant's arguments (pages 8-9 of the RCE amendment) concerning the FINAL rejections under 35 USC 103(a) have been rendered moot.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-Patent Literature

Hjelsvold, Rune, et al., "Web-based Personalization and Management of Interactive Video", WWW 10, Hong Kong, May 1-5, 2001, pp. 129-139 [ACM 1-59113-348-0/01/0005].

Blundo, Carlo, et al., "A Lightweight Protocol for the Generation and Distribution of Secure E-coupons", WWW 2002, Honolulu, HI, May 7-11, 2002, pp. 542-552 [ACM 1-59113-449-5/02/0005].

	US Patents
Gabbard et al	6,633,850
Landsman et al	6,880,123
Landsman et al	6,785,659
Hamzy et al	6,636,247
de Queiroz et al	6,272,251
Nielsen et al	6,055,542
Ozaki	5,574,802
Ozaki	5,699,453

17. Applicant's Amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Reg. No. 47,972
Art Unit 2176
Date: June 15, 2005

rms

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
6/21/2005